

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 31-41 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 2-30 are canceled. New claims 31-40 have been added to further clarify the claimed invention and to better focus the Examiner's attention on exemplary features and capabilities of the present invention that may not have been noted by reason of haven been buried in a single independent claim. These new claims are based on original claims 7-15, as well as the specification that supports these original claims, so new matter has been hereby added. The basis for new claim 41 is found at lines 12-17 of page 11, lines 7-10 of page 16, and lines 1-2 of page 32.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over US Patent 6,604,143 to Nagar et al., further in view of US Patent Application Publication US 2002/0178381 to Lee et al.

It is noted that Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein, if any, should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

The prior art rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

**I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION**

Applicants' invention, as disclosed and claimed in, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a method of capturing dialog on a computer network. Based on an initial access request to a first network node, contact is established with an intermediary node so that a subsequent dialog is directed through the intermediary node by causing a request inbound to the first network node to be directed to the intermediary node and causing a response outbound from the first network node that responds to the request to be directed to the intermediary node, wherein a plurality of requests inbound to the first network and a plurality of responding

YOR920030318US1 (YOR.481)

outbound responds are directed to the intermediary node, thereby capturing substantially an entirety of a dialog with the network node. The inbound request and the outbound response are directed to the intermediary node by causing a network address of the intermediary node to be added to the inbound request and to the outbound response. The dialog is logged, by storing in a memory predetermined data related to at least one of the inbound requests and the outbound responses. The intermediary node modifies the content of at least one of the inbound requests and the outbound responses, wherein the modifying includes adding the network address of the intermediary node so that the dialog continues to be directed to the intermediary address.

The conventional methods of capturing dialog with a web server, for such purpose as evaluating the effectiveness of a web site, as described beginning at line 2 of page 2 of the specification do not have the capability to capture both sides of the dialog, and so are incomplete.

In contrast, the present invention provides a method by which the complete dialog can be logged and analyzed for such evaluations as determining a measurement of parameters related to the effectiveness of a web site.

## **II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTION**

The Examiner alleges that Nagar, when modified by Lee, renders obvious claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree, since neither of these two references have the purpose of the present invention, to be able to capture a complete dialog between a user on a browser and a web site.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to clarify how this purpose differs from either of these two references. More specifically and turning to the clear language of the claims, in neither Nagar nor Lee is there a teaching or suggestion of: “ ... logging said dialog, by storing, in a memory, predetermined data related to at least one of said inbound requests and said outbound responses ....”, as required by independent claim 1.

S/N 10/728,755

Attorney Docket: YOR920030318US1 (YOR.481)

Furthermore, because of its different purpose, the present invention includes various capabilities not present or suggested in either of these two references.

For example, the previous final limitation of independent claim 1, now moved into dependent claim 36 (and 38), describes how the present invention is capable of capturing the wanderings of the user to other web sites.

In the rejection of record, for this limitation that was previously the final limitation of independent claim 1, the Examiner points to Figure 3 of Nagar and the description at lines 62-67 of column 6 and lines 34-35 of column 4. However, as represented by lines 62-67 of column 6, these descriptions describe, at most, the capability of having more than one client process at the same time on the proxy server of Nagar. This is an entirely different concept from that of being able to redirect the user's wanderings to other web sites, as required by dependent claims 36 and 38. Moreover, as described in claim 39, this redirection from additional web sites can be continued until the user makes a selection of a URL that is not related to the original web site.

Second, the present invention is used to calculate measurements on the complete dialog, such as described in claims 31-33, including the measurement of the effectiveness of a web site.

Third, the present invention can incorporate a natural language processing module, such as described in claim 34, thereby allowing a context of the dialog to be determined, and permitting the server to conduct an interview with the user, as required by claims 35 and 40, and to determine a state of the user, such as described in claim 41.

Thus, because of the different purpose of the present invention, there are features and capabilities of the claimed invention that is not present in the references currently of record.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection currently of record for claim 1.

YOR920030318US1 (YOR.481)

S/N 10/728,755

Attorney Docket: YOR920030318US1 (YOR.481)

### III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 31-41, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

Please charge any deficiencies in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.



Date: December 15, 2008

**McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817(703) 761-4100  
Customer No. 21254

YOR920030318US1 (YOR.481)